



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/891,828	06/25/2001	Norman Katz	441-26-001	1840
23935 7590 07/06/2007 KOPPEL, PATRICK & HEYBL 555 ST. CHARLES DRIVE SUITE 107 THOUSAND OAKS, CA 91360			EXAMINER AKINTOLA, OLABODE	
			ART UNIT 3691	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/06/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/891,828

Applicant(s)

KATZ, NORMAN

Examiner

Olabode Akintola

Art Unit

3691

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 April 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3 and 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Levchin et al (USPN 7089208) (Levchin).

Re claim 1: Levchin teaches an electronic funds transfer system comprising:

- a) a central controller CPU in electronic communication over the Internet with system users and participating banks, said central controller CPU accessible by one or more system users engaged in a fund transfer transaction, the CPU programmed to process the on-line transaction, monitor on-line electronic funds transfers and to function as a conduit for processing the transaction between system users (Fig. 2, col. 1, lines 44-61);
- b) means at each participating bank, in communication with the central controller CPU, for buyers and sellers of goods or services to establish electronic funds accounts linked to demand deposit accounts in said participating banks (col. 2, lines 5-16), wherein electronic representations of currency purchased by said buyers from demand deposit accounts in said participating banks are deposited in said buyer's electronic funds account, said electronic

representations of currency have an original monetary value tied to a selected actual currency (col. 4, lines 28-41);

c) a transaction processor module associated with said central controller CPU for processing interactive letters of credit, establishing and releasing, encumbrances on electronic funds deposited in said electronics funds accounts as financial transactions are entered into and consummated, said transaction processor module acting on instructions from the first system user to pay identified obligations to another user of said electronic funds transfer system (col. 12, lines 19-35);

d) a central controller storage module associated with the central controller CPU capable of storing information regarding all electronic on-line transactions between the buyers, sellers and the participating banks (col. 2, lines 8-11), said central controller CPU being programmed to automatically balance electronic funds with their corresponding bank reserves throughout the system on a selected periodic basis (col. 2, line 66- col. 3, line 3; col. 9, lines 52-53) and, on a selected periodic basis, issue reports of the status of such transactions, wherein the buyer in each transaction has control over the specification of electronic funds to be encumbered, the funds once encumbered being restricted from access by the buyer with the exception of release to the seller, unless released back to buyer by seller (col. 12, lines 19-35).

Re claim 2: Levchin teaches a new account module in communication with the central controller, said new account module accessible by users over the Internet, for qualifying new users and recording initial electronic representations of currency reserves deposited in support of electronic funds accounts at said participating bank (abstract; col. 1, lines 44-60; col. 2, lines 36-44; col. 15,

Art Unit: 3691

lines 9-67).

Re claim 3: Levchin teaches voice or video communications capability between system users and the central controller CPU (col. 1, lines 51-55).

Re claim 5: Levchin teaches encryption, de-encryption and re-encrypting capabilities for recording and storing transaction records in a secure data storage facility, data stored for each transaction being accessible only by the participants of the transaction and an authorized operator of the electronic funds transfer system (col. 6, lines 4-23).

Re claim 6: Levchin teaches that the system is accessible by a buyer and seller communicating therewith over the Internet using the central controller CPU as an intermediary, the central controller CPU providing information services, a data link between users, record financial transactions, funds encumbrances and unencumbrancing thereof and to reconcile funds transfers on completion of a transaction to the satisfaction of the buyer and seller (abstract, Figures).

Re claim 7: Levchin teaches wherein electronic funds encumbered by a first buyer for the benefit of a first seller can be re-encumbered by said first seller for the benefit of one or more second sellers or funds providers to which said first seller owes a financial obligation, such that when the transaction between the first buyer and the first seller is completed and the encumbrance by the first buyer on first buyer funds is released, the released funds are automatically transferred, pursuant to instructions of first seller, to such one or more second sellers or funds providers, and

prior sellers to said second sellers as so instructed by such participants electronically within the system (col. 1, lines 44-46; col. 7, lines 27-33).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levchin as applied to claims 1 and 3 above, in view of Rosen (USPN 5557518) ("Rosen").

Re claim 4: Levchin does not explicitly teach electronic and person assisted dispute resolution and customer support services. Rosen teaches electronic and person assisted dispute resolution and customer support services (col. 2, lines 38-41; col. 9, lines 41-43; col. 28, lines 39-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify

Levchin to include this step. One would have been motivated to do so in order to resolve disputes arising from the transaction between the buyer and seller.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Rosen (USPN 5453601 and 5453601) teach electronic monetary system.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olabode Akintola whose telephone number is 571-272-3629.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30AM -5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on 571-272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

OA



HANI M. KAZIMI
PRIMARY EXAMINER